

Little Heterotic Strings

Alon E. Faraggi* and Elisa Manno†

*Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Liverpool,
Liverpool L69 7ZL, United Kingdom*

Abstract

We discuss toroidal orbifolds of the $E_8 \times E_8$ heterotic string, in which the free fermionic Higgs-matter splitting is implemented by a shift in the internal lattice coupled with the fermion numbers of the gauge degrees of freedom. We consider models in which some choices of the orbifold result in the projection of the graviton. In the models that we consider the projection also results in flipping the spin-statistics assignments in the massive string spectrum, whereas the massless spectrum retains the conventional spin-statistics assignments. We argue that the partition functions are mathematically consistent for one- and multi-loop amplitudes, owing to the existence of supersymmetry in the spectrum. A duality between different models at nonzero temperature is briefly discussed.

* E-mail address: faraggi@amtp.liv.ac.uk

† E-mail address: manno@liverpool.ac.uk

1 Introduction

The Standard Model of particle physics is a non-supersymmetric renormalizable point-like quantum field theory and it accounts successfully for all sub-atomic experimental data to date. On the other hand, gravity, which describes physical phenomena at the celestial and cosmological scales cannot be formulated consistently as a non-supersymmetric point like quantum field theory. However, there is nothing sacred about the point-like idealisation of elementary particles. The mundane generalisation of point-like particles to strings provides a framework for a consistent common formalism of gravity and the sub-atomic interactions. Indeed, string theory gives rise to phenomenological models that are used to explore how string theory connects to contemporary experimental data. An important step in the development of string theory was obtained by the understanding that the five different supersymmetric ten dimensional theories, as well as eleven dimensional supergravity, may be related by perturbative and nonperturbative duality transformations [1, 2]. However, it is well known that string theory gives rise to a number of nonsupersymmetric ten dimensional vacua that may be tachyonic or non-tachyonic [3, 4]. It is plausible that the resolution of some of the phenomenological issues facing string theory, in particular in relation to the cosmological evolution and vacuum selection, will be gained by improved understanding of these non-supersymmetric vacua and how they fit in the fundamental theory that underlies the string theories. Furthermore, it is likely that progress can be achieved by exploring some of the features of these vacua in connection with the phenomenological string vacua.

In this paper we therefore pursue this line of exploration. The relevant class of phenomenological string vacua are the quasi-realistic heterotic-string models in the free fermionic formulation that are related to $Z_2 \times Z_2$ orbifold models. Quasi-realistic orbifold models have been constructed primarily by using bosonic techniques (see *e.g.* [5] and references therein), that provide a better insight to the underlying geometry. There is crucial distinction, however, between the models based on the fermionic techniques and those based on the bosonic techniques in that the latter start from the $E_8 \times E_8$ heterotic-string and compactify six dimensions on an internal manifold, whereas the fermionic models are formulated directly in four space-time dimensions. In particular, the fermionic models utilise a projection that is reminiscent of the projection from the ten dimensional $E_8 \times E_8$ vacuum to the $SO(16) \times SO(16)$ one. The important consequence of this projection in the quasi-realistic fermionic orbifold models is that it breaks the E_6 GUT symmetry to $SO(10) \times U(1)$ and splits the spinorial (matter) and vectorial (Higgs) representations [6]. In ref. [7] it was shown how the two partition functions pertaining to the four dimensional free fermionic models with $E_8 \times E_8$ and $SO(16) \times SO(16)$ gauge groups can be connected by an orbifold projection. A route to improve the understanding of phenomenological string models can be achieved by implementing this projection in the corresponding bosonic orbifold constructions. In this paper we undertake this task. In the pursuit

of this analysis we will explore a slight variation of our initial orbifold that will open up new vistas. The slight variation is a discrete change of a sign in the orbifold action that results in a partition function that does not contain gravity at all, *i.e.* it is a “little heterotic string”, in this sense the model under consideration is similar to the little string theories considered previously (see for example [8, 10, 11] and references therein). Yet, it corresponds to a modular invariant critical string theory, *i.e.* it is a consistent string vacuum. In the spirit that we espouse here, in order to improve our understanding of string theory, it is vital to explore all the consistent string vacua and not merely those that may be phenomenologically relevant.

While the orbifold projection is a discrete choice, it is often seen that it can arise from discrete choices of vacuum expectation values of background fields. In this respect the a priori distinct vacua may be connected by continuous variation of the background field. While in the effective field theory limit the two vacua are distinct and cannot be connected, at the string level massless and massive states are exchanged by duality transformations. This is the view for example in the case of the spinor–vector duality recently observed in free fermionic heterotic string models [12]. Following this lead and by compactifying the time coordinate we investigate the possibility that the two partition functions can arise from suitable choices of the background parameters and argue that this is in fact possible. The implication is that the graviton is not different from any other string mode. Namely, it can be exchanged between the massive and massless spectrum and can be viewed as arising dynamically by some suitable choice of specific background parameters.

2 Elements of free fermionic models

In this section we highlight the features of the free fermion models that will be exploited in subsequent analysis. In the free fermionic formulation of the heterotic string in four dimensions all the world-sheet degrees of freedom required to cancel the conformal anomaly are represented in terms of free fermions propagating on the string world-sheet [13]. In the light-cone gauge the world-sheet fermion field content consists of twenty real fermions in the supersymmetric sector and forty–four real fermions in the non–supersymmetric sector. Under parallel transport around a non–contractible loop on the toroidal world-sheet the fermionic fields pick up a phase, $f \rightarrow -e^{i\pi\alpha(f)} f$, $\alpha(f) \in (-1, +1]$. Each set of specified phases for all world-sheet fermions around all the non–contractible loops is called the spin structure of the model. Such spin structures are usually given in the form of 64 dimensional boundary condition vectors, with each element of the vector specifying the phase of the corresponding world-sheet fermion. The basis vectors are constrained by string consistency requirements and completely determine the vacuum structure of the model. The physical spectrum is obtained by applying the generalised GSO projections.

The boundary condition basis defining a typical “realistic free fermionic heterotic string model” is constructed in two stages. The first stage consists of the NAHE

set, which is a set of five boundary condition basis vectors, $\{1, S, b_1, b_2, b_3\}$ [14]. The gauge group after imposing the GSO projections induced by the NAHE set is $\text{SO}(10) \times \text{SO}(6)^3 \times \text{E}_8$ with $N = 1$ supersymmetry. The space-time vector bosons that generate the gauge group arise from the Neveu-Schwarz sector and from the sector $\xi_2 \equiv 1 + b_1 + b_2 + b_3$. The Neveu-Schwarz sector produces the generators of $\text{SO}(10) \times \text{SO}(6)^3 \times \text{SO}(16)$. The ξ_2 -sector produces the spinorial 128 of $\text{SO}(16)$ and completes the hidden gauge group to E_8 . The second stage of the construction consists of adding to the NAHE set three (or four) additional boundary condition basis vectors, typically denoted by $\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$ [15]. These additional basis vectors reduce the number of generations to three chiral generations, one from each of the sectors b_1 , b_2 and b_3 and simultaneously break $\text{SO}(10)$ to one of its subgroups $\text{SU}(5) \times \text{U}(1)$, $\text{SO}(6) \times \text{SO}(4)$, $\text{SU}(3) \times \text{SU}(2) \times \text{U}(1)^2$ or $\text{SU}(3) \times \text{SU}(2)^2 \times \text{U}(1)$.

The correspondence of the NAHE-based free fermionic models with the orbifold construction is illustrated by extending the NAHE set, $\{1, S, b_1, b_2, b_3\}$, by one additional boundary condition basis vector [16]

$$\xi_1 = (0, \dots, 0 | \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{\bar{\psi}^1, \dots, 5, \bar{\eta}^1, 2, 3}, 0, \dots, 0) . \quad (2.1)$$

With a suitable choice of the GSO projection coefficients the model possesses an $\text{SO}(4)^3 \times \text{E}_6 \times \text{U}(1)^2 \times \text{E}_8$ gauge group and $N = 1$ space-time supersymmetry. The matter fields include 24 generations in the 27 representation of E_6 , eight from each of the sectors $b_1 \oplus b_1 + \xi_1$, $b_2 \oplus b_2 + \xi_1$ and $b_3 \oplus b_3 + \xi_1$. Three additional 27 and $\overline{27}$ pairs are obtained from the Neveu-Schwarz $\oplus \xi_1$ sector.

To construct the model in the orbifold formulation one starts with the compactification on a torus with nontrivial background fields [17]. The subset of basis vectors

$$\{1, S, \xi_1, \xi_2\} \quad (2.2)$$

generates a toroidally-compactified model with $N = 4$ space-time supersymmetry and $\text{SO}(12) \times \text{E}_8 \times \text{E}_8$ gauge group. The same model is obtained in the geometric (bosonic) language by tuning the background fields to the values corresponding to the $\text{SO}(12)$ lattice. The metric of the six-dimensional compactified manifold is then the Cartan matrix of $\text{SO}(12)$, while the antisymmetric tensor is given by

$$B_{ij} = \begin{cases} G_{ij} & ; i > j, \\ 0 & ; i = j, \\ -G_{ij} & ; i < j. \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

When all the radii of the six-dimensional compactified manifold are fixed at $R_I = \sqrt{2}$, it is seen that the left- and right-moving momenta $P_{R,L}^I = [m_i - \frac{1}{2}(B_{ij} \pm G_{ij})n_j]e_i^{I*}$ reproduce the massless root vectors in the lattice of $\text{SO}(12)$. Here $e^i = \{e_i^I\}$ are six linearly-independent vielbeins normalised so that $(e_i)^2 = 2$. The e_i^{I*} are dual to the e_i , with $e_i^* \cdot e_j = \delta_{ij}$.

Adding the two basis vectors b_1 and b_2 to the set (2.2) corresponds to the $Z_2 \times Z_2$ orbifold model with standard embedding. Starting from the Narain model with $\text{SO}(12) \times \text{E}_8 \times \text{E}_8$ symmetry [17] and applying the $Z_2 \times Z_2$ twist on the internal coordinates, reproduces the spectrum of the free-fermion model with the six-dimensional basis set $\{1, S, \xi_1, \xi_2, b_1, b_2\}$. The Euler characteristic of this model is 48 with $h_{11} = 27$ and $h_{21} = 3$. It is noted that the effect of the additional basis vector ξ_1 of eq. (2.1) is to separate the gauge degrees of freedom, spanned by the world-sheet fermions $\{\bar{\psi}^{1,\dots,5}, \bar{\eta}^1, \bar{\eta}^2, \bar{\eta}^3, \bar{\phi}^{1,\dots,8}\}$, from the internal compactified degrees of freedom $\{y, \omega|\bar{y}, \bar{\omega}\}^{1,\dots,6}$. In the "realistic free fermionic models" this is achieved by the vector 2γ [16]

$$2\gamma = (0, \dots, 0 | \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{\bar{\psi}^{1,\dots,5}, \bar{\eta}^{1,2,3} \bar{\phi}^{1,\dots,4}}, 0, \dots, 0), \quad (2.4)$$

which breaks the $\text{E}_8 \times \text{E}_8$ symmetry to $\text{SO}(16) \times \text{SO}(16)$. The $Z_2 \times Z_2$ twist breaks the gauge symmetry to $\text{SO}(4)^3 \times \text{SO}(10) \times \text{U}(1)^3 \times \text{SO}(16)$. The orbifold still yields a model with 24 generations, eight from each twisted sector, but now the generations are in the chiral 16 representation of $\text{SO}(10)$, rather than in the 27 of E_6 . The same model can be realized with the set $\{1, S, \xi_1, \xi_2, b_1, b_2\}$, by projecting out the $16 \oplus \bar{16}$ from the ξ_1 -sector by taking

$$c \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1 \\ \xi_2 \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow -c \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1 \\ \xi_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.5)$$

This choice also projects out the massless vector bosons in the 128 of $\text{SO}(16)$ in the hidden-sector E_8 gauge group, thereby breaking the $\text{E}_6 \times \text{E}_8$ symmetry to $\text{SO}(10) \times \text{U}(1) \times \text{SO}(16)$. The freedom in (2.5) corresponds to a discrete torsion in the toroidal orbifold model. At the level of the $N = 4$ Narain model generated by the set (2.2), we can define two models, Z_+ and Z_- , depending on the sign of the discrete torsion in eq. (2.5). The first, say Z_+ , produces the $\text{E}_8 \times \text{E}_8$ model, whereas the second, say Z_- , produces the $\text{SO}(16) \times \text{SO}(16)$ model. However, the $Z_2 \times Z_2$ twist acts identically in the two models and their physical characteristics differ only due to the discrete torsion eq. (2.5). The partition functions corresponding to the Z_- and Z_+ vacua are given respectively by

$$\begin{aligned} Z_- = (V_8 - S_8) \times [& (|O_{12}|^2 + |V_{12}|^2) (\bar{O}_{16} \bar{O}_{16} + \bar{C}_{16} \bar{C}_{16}) \\ & + (|S_{12}|^2 + |C_{12}|^2) (\bar{S}_{16} \bar{S}_{16} + \bar{V}_{16} \bar{V}_{16}) \\ & + (O_{12} \bar{V}_{12} + V_{12} \bar{O}_{12}) (\bar{S}_{16} \bar{V}_{16} + \bar{V}_{16} \bar{S}_{16}) \\ & + (S_{12} \bar{C}_{12} + C_{12} \bar{S}_{12}) (\bar{O}_{16} \bar{C}_{16} + \bar{C}_{16} \bar{O}_{16})] \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

and

$$Z_+ = (V_8 - S_8) [|O_{12}|^2 + |V_{12}|^2 + |S_{12}|^2 + |C_{12}|^2] (\bar{O}_{16} + \bar{S}_{16}) (\bar{O}_{16} + \bar{S}_{16}), \quad (2.7)$$

depending on the sign of the discrete torsion in eq. (2.5). Here we have written $Z_{\pm}$ in terms of level-one $\text{SO}(2n)$ characters (see, for instance [18])

$$\begin{aligned} O_{2n} &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\vartheta_3^n}{\eta^n} + \frac{\vartheta_4^n}{\eta^n} \right), \\ V_{2n} &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\vartheta_3^n}{\eta^n} - \frac{\vartheta_4^n}{\eta^n} \right), \\ S_{2n} &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\vartheta_2^n}{\eta^n} + i^{-n} \frac{\vartheta_1^n}{\eta^n} \right), \\ C_{2n} &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\vartheta_2^n}{\eta^n} - i^{-n} \frac{\vartheta_1^n}{\eta^n} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

These two models can actually be connected by the orbifold

$$Z_- = Z_+ / a \otimes b, \quad (2.9)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} a &= (-1)^{F_L^{\text{int}} + F_{\xi_1}}, \\ b &= (-1)^{F_L^{\text{int}} + F_{\xi_2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

where F_L^{int} is a fermion number in the internal lattice and F_{ξ_1}, F_{ξ_2} are fermion numbers acting in the observable and hidden gauge sectors, respectively. The orbifold projection given in eqs (2.9) and (2.10) is defined at the free fermionic point in the moduli space since Z_+ and Z_- are expressed at this point. However, it can be generalised to arbitrary points in the moduli space and hence can be employed to construct orbifold models that originate from the Z_- partition function, in analogy to the case in the free fermionic constructions. Let us consider for simplicity the case of six orthogonal circles with radii R_i . The partition function reads

$$Z_+ = (V_8 - S_8) \left(\sum_{m,n} \Lambda_{m,n} \right)^{\otimes 6} (\overline{O}_{16} + \overline{S}_{16}) (\overline{O}_{16} + \overline{S}_{16}), \quad (2.11)$$

where as usual, for each circle,

$$p_{\text{L,R}}^i = \frac{m_i}{R_i} \pm \frac{n_i R_i}{\alpha'} \quad (2.12)$$

and

$$\Lambda_{m,n} = \frac{q^{\frac{\alpha'}{4} p_{\text{L}}^2} \bar{q}^{\frac{\alpha'}{4} p_{\text{R}}^2}}{|\eta|^2}. \quad (2.13)$$

In the case of one compactified dimension the Z_+ partition function is given by

$$Z_+^{9d} = (V_8 - S_8) \Lambda_{m,n} (\overline{O}_{16} + \overline{S}_{16}) (\overline{O}_{16} + \overline{S}_{16}). \quad (2.14)$$

Applying the orbifold projections

$$\begin{aligned} a &= (-1)^{F_{\xi_1}} \delta, \\ b &= (-1)^{F_{\xi_2}} \delta, \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

where $\delta x^9 = x_9 + \pi R$, $\xi_1 = \{\bar{\psi}^{1,\dots,5}, \bar{\eta}^{1,2,3}\}$ and $\xi_2 = \{\bar{\phi}^{1,\dots,8}\}$, in Z_+^{9d} produces the Z_-^{9d} partition function given by

$$\begin{aligned} Z_-^{9d} = \sqrt{\tau_2} Z_{bos.}(V_8 - S_8) [& \Lambda_{2m,n} (\overline{O}_{16} \overline{O}_{16} + \overline{C}_{16} \overline{C}_{16}) \\ & + \Lambda_{2m+1,n} (\overline{S}_{16} \overline{S}_{16} + \overline{V}_{16} \overline{V}_{16}) \\ & + \Lambda_{2m,n+\frac{1}{2}} (\overline{S}_{16} \overline{V}_{16} + \overline{V}_{16} \overline{S}_{16}) \\ & + \Lambda_{2m+1,n+\frac{1}{2}} (\overline{O}_{16} \overline{C}_{16} + \overline{C}_{16} \overline{O}_{16})] . \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

We note here that the shift given by δ differs from the shifts that were found in ref. [7] to reproduce the partition function of the $SO(12)$ lattice at the maximally symmetric free fermionic point, given in eq.(2.7). Since the string on a compactified coordinate contains momentum and winding modes, one can shift the coordinate along either and also allow shifts that mix the momentum and winding modes. Indeed, the precise identification of the lattice at the free fermionic point is obtained for shifts that mix momentum and winding modes. Here, we restrict ourselves to the simpler shifts and incorporation of other shifts is left for future work.

The partition function from the free fermion model $\{1, S, \xi_1, \xi_2\}$, with $1 + S + \xi_1 + \xi_2 = \{y^1, \omega^1 \mid \bar{y}^1, \bar{\omega}^1\}$, is given by¹

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{9d} = & \frac{1}{2^4} (\theta_3^4 - \theta_4^4 - \theta_2^4 - \theta_1^4) \{ (|\theta_3|^2 + |\theta_4|^2 + |\theta_2|^2 + |\theta_1|^2) (\bar{\theta}_3^{16} + \bar{\theta}_4^{16} + \bar{\theta}_2^{16} + \bar{\theta}_1^{16}) \\ & + \left[|\theta_3|^2 + |\theta_4|^2 + c \left(\frac{\xi_1}{\xi_2} \right) (|\theta_2|^2 + |\theta_1|^2) \right] \left[\bar{\theta}_3^8 \bar{\theta}_4^8 + \bar{\theta}_4^8 \bar{\theta}_3^8 + c \left(\frac{\xi_1}{\xi_2} \right) (\bar{\theta}_2^8 \bar{\theta}_1^8 + \bar{\theta}_1^8 \bar{\theta}_2^8) \right] \\ & + \left[|\theta_3|^2 + c \left(\frac{\xi_1}{\xi_2} \right) (|\theta_4|^2 + |\theta_1|^2) + |\theta_2|^2 \right] \left[\bar{\theta}_2^8 \bar{\theta}_3^8 + \bar{\theta}_3^8 \bar{\theta}_2^8 + c \left(\frac{\xi_1}{\xi_2} \right) (\bar{\theta}_4^8 \bar{\theta}_1^8 + \bar{\theta}_1^8 \bar{\theta}_4^8) \right] \\ & \left[c \left(\frac{\xi_1}{\xi_2} \right) (|\theta_3|^2 + |\theta_1|^2) + |\theta_4|^2 + |\theta_2|^2 \right] \left[\bar{\theta}_2^8 \bar{\theta}_4^8 + \bar{\theta}_4^8 \bar{\theta}_2^8 + c \left(\frac{\xi_1}{\xi_2} \right) (\bar{\theta}_3^8 \bar{\theta}_1^8 + \bar{\theta}_1^8 \bar{\theta}_3^8) \right] \} . \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

In terms of the characters given in eq. (2.8) we have

$$Z_+ = (V_8 - S_8) (|O_2|^2 + |V_2|^2 + |S_2|^2 + |C_2|^2) (\overline{O}_{16} + \overline{S}_{16}) (\overline{O}_{16} + \overline{S}_{16}) \quad (2.18)$$

and

$$Z_- = (V_8 - S_8) \times [(|O_2|^2 + |V_2|^2) (\overline{O}_{16} \overline{O}_{16} + \overline{C}_{16} \overline{C}_{16})$$

¹We included the terms with θ_1 to facilitate the translation to the characters given in eq. (2.8).

$$\begin{aligned}
& + (|S_2|^2 + |C_2|^2) (\bar{S}_{16} \bar{S}_{16} + \bar{V}_{16} \bar{V}_{16}) \\
& + (O_2 \bar{V}_2 + V_2 \bar{O}_2) (\bar{S}_{16} \bar{V}_{16} + \bar{V}_{16} \bar{S}_{16}) \\
& + (S_2 \bar{C}_2 + C_2 \bar{S}_2) (\bar{O}_{16} \bar{C}_{16} + \bar{C}_{16} \bar{O}_{16}) \Big] . \tag{2.19}
\end{aligned}$$

In this case the orbifold operation is

$$\begin{aligned}
a &= (-1)^{F_L^{\text{int}} + F_{\xi_1}} , \\
b &= (-1)^{F_L^{\text{int}} + F_{\xi_2}} , \tag{2.20}
\end{aligned}$$

where F_L^{int} acts on 9th dimension.

2.1 10D case

We comment here on the ten dimensional case. The free fermionic model is $\{1, \xi_1, \xi_2\}$, with $1 + \xi_1 + \xi_2 = S$.

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{10d} &= \frac{1}{2^3} \{ (\theta_3^4 - \theta_4^4 - \theta_2^4 - \theta_1^4) (\bar{\theta}_3^{16} + \bar{\theta}_4^{16} + \bar{\theta}_2^{16} + \bar{\theta}_1^{16}) \\
&+ \left[\theta_3^4 - \theta_4^4 - c \left(\frac{\xi_1}{\xi_2} \right) (\theta_2^4 + \theta_1^4) \right] \left[\bar{\theta}_3^8 \bar{\theta}_4^8 + \bar{\theta}_4^8 \bar{\theta}_3^8 + c \left(\frac{\xi_1}{\xi_2} \right) (\bar{\theta}_2^8 \bar{\theta}_1^8 + \bar{\theta}_1^8 \bar{\theta}_2^8) \right] \\
&+ \left[\theta_3^4 - c \left(\frac{\xi_1}{\xi_2} \right) (\theta_4^4 + \theta_1^4) - \theta_2^4 \right] \left[\bar{\theta}_2^8 \bar{\theta}_3^8 + \bar{\theta}_3^8 \bar{\theta}_2^8 + c \left(\frac{\xi_1}{\xi_2} \right) (\bar{\theta}_4^8 \bar{\theta}_1^8 + \bar{\theta}_1^8 \bar{\theta}_4^8) \right] \\
&\left[c \left(\frac{\xi_1}{\xi_2} \right) (\theta_3^4 - \theta_1^4) - \theta_4^4 - \theta_2^4 \right] \left[\bar{\theta}_2^8 \bar{\theta}_4^8 + \bar{\theta}_4^8 \bar{\theta}_2^8 + c \left(\frac{\xi_1}{\xi_2} \right) (\bar{\theta}_3^8 \bar{\theta}_1^8 + \bar{\theta}_1^8 \bar{\theta}_3^8) \right] \} . \tag{2.21}
\end{aligned}$$

In terms of $SO(2n)$ characters Z_+ and Z_- are respectively given by

$$Z_+ = (V_8 - S_8) (\bar{O}_{16} + \bar{S}_{16}) (\bar{O}_{16} + \bar{S}_{16}) \tag{2.22}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_- &= V_8 (\bar{O}_{16} \bar{O}_{16} + \bar{C}_{16} \bar{C}_{16}) - S_8 (\bar{S}_{16} \bar{S}_{16} + \bar{V}_{16} \bar{V}_{16}) \\
&+ O_8 (\bar{S}_{16} \bar{V}_{16} + \bar{V}_{16} \bar{S}_{16}) - C_8 (\bar{O}_{16} \bar{C}_{16} + \bar{C}_{16} \bar{O}_{16}) . \tag{2.23}
\end{aligned}$$

The projection implemented in Z_+ is

$$\begin{aligned}
a &= (-1)^{F + F_{\xi_1}} , \\
b &= (-1)^{F + F_{\xi_2}} , \tag{2.24}
\end{aligned}$$

with F the space-time fermion number and $F_{\xi_{1,2}}$ as before. The choice for the discrete torsion is "-". The projection in the ten dimensional case reproduces the partition function of the non-supersymmetric $SO(16) \times SO(16)$ heterotic string. Thus, we note that in the free fermion model the same discrete choice of the phase $c \left(\frac{\xi_1}{\xi_2} \right)$ is employed in the ten dimensional and four dimensional models.

3 Little heterotic strings

In this section we explore other orbifold projections induced by the orbifold given in eq. (2.15). We comment that the new partition functions that we construct are mathematically consistent in the sense that they satisfy modular invariance and world-sheet supersymmetry. Furthermore, they admit the Jacobi theta-function identity on the world-sheet supersymmetric side. Therefore, the spectrum possesses $N = 4$ space-time supersymmetry and the partition function is identically zero. Consequently, supersymmetric non-renormalization theorems indicate that these string partition functions are mathematically consistent also at multi-loops. However, these string solutions are not physical in the sense that the graviton and gauge vector bosons are projected out by the GSO projections. Additionally, the conventional spin-statistics assignments, while they hold for massless states, are flipped for massive states in the string spectrum. Hence, the partition functions that we present below do not give rise to physical vacua and corresponding low energy effective field theories. Nevertheless, in our judgement they do correspond to mathematically consistent solutions in the sense articulated above and their role for a complete understanding of string theory is therefore important. We comment that in terms of free fermion it is well known that the condition $c_{b_j}^{NS} = \delta_{b_j}$ guarantees the existence of the graviton in the spectrum. Analysis of partition functions that do not satisfy this condition has not been presented to date.

The partition function of the $E_8 \times E_8$ heterotic string in ten dimensions compactified on a generic six torus is shown in eq. (2.11). We introduce a shift in one compact dimension x^9

$$\delta : x^9 \rightarrow x^9 + \pi R, \quad \delta^2 = 1 \quad (3.1)$$

and consider the corresponding shift orbifold generated by the elements

$$(1, (-1)^{F_{\xi_1}} \delta, (-1)^{F_{\xi_2}} \delta, (-1)^{F_{\xi_1} + F_{\xi_2}}) = (1, a, b, ab),$$

where F_{ξ_1} is the fermion number in the sector describing the first E_8 gauge group and F_{ξ_2} is the fermion number in the sector describing the second E_8 gauge group. One can consider different options for the signs of the elements of the orbifold group. Different choices will obviously lead to different partition functions after orbifolding of the initial model. We introduce the projection operator

$$\frac{1 \mp (-1)^{F_{\xi_1}} \delta}{2} \times \frac{1 + (-1)^{F_{\xi_2}} \delta}{2} = \frac{1}{4} \{ 1 \mp (-1)^{F_{\xi_1}} \delta + (-1)^{F_{\xi_2}} \delta \mp (-1)^{F_{\xi_1} + F_{\xi_2}} \} \quad (3.2)$$

and proceed with the choice of the minus sign in the first projector of eq. (3.2). The full partition function which is obtained from (2.11) and is invariant under the orbifold group is given by

$$Z_{tot} = Z_{oo} + \sum_i Z_{oi} + \sum_i (Z_{io} + Z_{ii}) + c_o \sum_{i \neq j} Z_{ij}, \quad (3.3)$$

where $i, j \in \{-a, b, -ab\}$ and the constant c_o is the discrete torsion which can assume values ± 1 . The first two terms in (3.3) correspond to the untwisted sector of the orbifold and are given by

$$Z_o = Z_{oo} + \sum_i Z_{oi} = Z_{o,o} - Z_{o,ab} - Z_{o,a} + Z_{o,b} \quad (3.4)$$

or explicitly

$$\begin{aligned} Z_o = \frac{1}{4}(V_8 - S_8)\Lambda_1\Lambda_2\Lambda_{m',n'}\Lambda_{m,n}[& (\overline{O}_{16} + \overline{S}_{16})(\overline{O}_{16} + \overline{S}_{16}) \\ & - (\overline{O}_{16} - \overline{S}_{16})(\overline{O}_{16} - \overline{S}_{16}) \\ & + (-1)^m\{-(\overline{O}_{16} - \overline{S}_{16})(\overline{O}_{16} + \overline{S}_{16}) \\ & + (\overline{O}_{16} + \overline{S}_{16})(\overline{O}_{16} - \overline{S}_{16})\}]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

In a similar way the last two terms in (3.3) correspond to the twisted sector and they read explicitly

$$\sum_i (Z_{io} + Z_{ii}) = -Z_{a,o} + Z_{b,o} - Z_{ab,o} - Z_{a,a} + Z_{b,b} - Z_{ab,ab}, \quad (3.6)$$

$$\sum_{i \neq j} Z_{i,j} = Z_{a,b} + Z_{b,a} + Z_{ab,a} + Z_{ab,b} + Z_{b,ab} + Z_{a,ab}. \quad (3.7)$$

Below we choose the value of c_o to be $+1$. Let us note also that if one takes the sign $+$ in the projection (3.2) then all terms in equations (3.4), (3.6), (3.7) which have the sign $-$ will change it to $+$. It is straightforward to check that the partition function (3.3) is invariant under S and T transformations, as well under the action of the orbifold group. Putting all these into (3.3) we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Z_- = (V_8 - S_8)\Lambda_1\Lambda_2\Lambda_{m',n'}[& \Lambda_{2m,n} (\overline{S}_{16}\overline{O}_{16} - \overline{C}_{16}\overline{C}_{16}) \\ & + \Lambda_{2m+1,n} (\overline{O}_{16}\overline{S}_{16} - \overline{V}_{16}\overline{V}_{16}) \\ & + \Lambda_{2m,n+\frac{1}{2}} (\overline{S}_{16}\overline{C}_{16} - \overline{C}_{16}\overline{O}_{16}) \\ & + \Lambda_{2m+1,n+\frac{1}{2}} (\overline{O}_{16}\overline{V}_{16} - \overline{V}_{16}\overline{S}_{16})]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

From the expression above one can see that the zero mass spectrum of the model does not contain the graviton because of the absence of the term $\overline{O}_{16}\overline{O}_{16}$ in the right sector. By similar reason there are no gauge degrees of freedom either since the adjoint representation of the gauge group has been projected out as well. Essentially one ends up with a number of scalar, vector and fermion fields in the zero mass sector. On the other hand, if one takes the second $(+)$ sign in the equation (3.2), one obtains the model described by a partition function

$$\begin{aligned} Z'_- = (V_8 - S_8)\Lambda_1\Lambda_2\Lambda_{m',n'}[& \Lambda_{2m,n} (\overline{O}_{16}\overline{O}_{16} + \overline{C}_{16}\overline{C}_{16}) \\ & + \Lambda_{2m+1,n} (\overline{S}_{16}\overline{S}_{16} + \overline{V}_{16}\overline{V}_{16}) \\ & + \Lambda_{2m,n+\frac{1}{2}} (\overline{O}_{16}\overline{C}_{16} + \overline{C}_{16}\overline{O}_{16}) \\ & + \Lambda_{2m+1,n+\frac{1}{2}} (\overline{V}_{16}\overline{S}_{16} + \overline{S}_{16}\overline{V}_{16})], \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

with $c_o = +1$, which contains both gravity and Yang-Mills fields as its massless excitations. Therefore, we observe that starting from the $E_8 \times E_8$ heterotic superstring and performing different orbifold projections one can obtain mathematically consistent heterotic-string solutions with or without gravity and Yang-Mills fields. We note from eq. (3.8) that the second term in each row has the opposite sign in terms of space-time spin statistics. All the states with the "wrong" space-times statistics are massive string states, whereas the massless states satisfy the conventional spin-statistics assignments. Clearly, therefore, the partition function does not give rise to a physical vacuum with a local effective field theory limit. The violation of the spin-statistics assignments indicates the presence of ghosts in the spectrum and may signal mathematical inconsistency of this solution for one-loop, or multi-loop amplitudes. However, owing to the Jacobi identity on the supersymmetric side of eq. (3.8) the spectrum is supersymmetric and tachyon free. Consequently, the one-loop partition function in eq. (3.8) vanishes exactly, whereas supersymmetric non-renormalization theorems indicate that multi-loop amplitudes are not renormalized. In the next section we perform a further Z_2 orbifold projection of eq. (3.8) and discuss the spectra in more details.

As a second example of a little heterotic string we consider the orbifold of (2.11) by the projection operator given by

$$\frac{1 - (-1)^{F_{\xi_1}} \delta}{2} \times \frac{1 - (-1)^{F_{\xi_2}} \delta}{2} = \frac{1}{4} \{1 - (-1)^{F_{\xi_1}} \delta - (-1)^{F_{\xi_2}} \delta + (-1)^{F_{\xi_1} + F_{\xi_2}}\}. \quad (3.10)$$

In this case the resulting partition function for the case with $c_o = -1$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Z''_- = & (V_8 - S_8) \Lambda_1 \Lambda_2 \Lambda_{m',n'} [\Lambda_{2m+1,n} (\overline{O}_{16} \overline{O}_{16} + \overline{C}_{16} \overline{C}_{16}) \\ & + \Lambda_{2m,n} (\overline{S}_{16} \overline{S}_{16} + \overline{V}_{16} \overline{V}_{16}) \\ & - \Lambda_{2m,n+\frac{1}{2}} (\overline{C}_{16} \overline{O}_{16} + \overline{O}_{16} \overline{C}_{16}) \\ & - \Lambda_{2m+1,n+\frac{1}{2}} (\overline{S}_{16} \overline{V}_{16} + \overline{V}_{16} \overline{S}_{16})]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

We note from the first line of eq. (3.11) that in this case the $\overline{O}_{16} \overline{O}_{16}$ term on the non-supersymmetric side, that gives rise to the graviton and gauge vector bosons, is present. However, this term couples to $\Lambda_{2m+1,n}$ in the compactified shifted lattice, which is massive at generic points in the moduli space. and gives rise to massless states at the enhanced symmetry point with $R = \sqrt{\alpha'}$. Also in this case the graviton and the gauge vector bosons are not among the massless states. From the third and fourth rows of eq. (3.11) we note again that the massive states produced by this partition function do not satisfy the physical spin-statistics assignments. In this model the states with the "wrong" statistics couple to a lattice with winding modes shifted by $1/2$ and hence there are no zero modes with the wrong statistics. We note in these examples a link between the projection of the graviton and the assignments of "wrong" statistics in the massive string spectrum. As we argued above, while clearly

non-physical, this does not signal a mathematical inconsistency of these solutions for one- or multi-loop amplitudes, due to existence of supersymmetry in the spectrum, owing to the Jacobi identity on the supersymmetric side. One can further contemplate in the case of (3.11) the breaking of $N = 4$ to $N = 2$ and $N = 1$ by Z_2 twists of the internal lattice and the possibility that the resulting spectrum in the twisted sectors is physically sensible, *i.e.* that the massless twisted states satisfy the conventional spin-statistics assignments.

4 Z_2 projection

In this section we consider the Z_2 orbifold of the partition function (3.8). The Z_2 is generated by the elements $(1, h)$ where h acts on the coordinates of the internal tori as

$$Z_1 \rightarrow e^{i\pi} Z_1 \quad , \quad Z_2 \rightarrow e^{i\pi} Z_2 \quad , \quad Z_3 \rightarrow Z_3 \quad .$$

As in the case of the standard embedding the element h acts non-trivially on the gauge degrees of freedom of the heterotic string as well. For this reason it is convenient to decompose the $SO(2n)$ characters in such a way to keep O_4, V_4, S_4 and C_4 factors (on which the element h acts non-trivially) explicit. In particular the Z_{oo} part of the partition function or equivalently the partition function (3.8) can be rewritten in the form

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{oo} = & \frac{1}{4} [V_4 O_4 + O_4 V_4 - S_4 S_4 - C_4 C_4] \Lambda_1 \Lambda_2 \Lambda_{m', n'} \\ & \times \{ (\Lambda_{2m, n} + \Lambda_{2m, n + \frac{1}{2}}) (\bar{S}_4 \bar{S}_{12} + \bar{C}_4 \bar{C}_{12} - \bar{S}_4 \bar{C}_{12} - \bar{C}_4 \bar{S}_{12}) (\bar{O}_{16} + \bar{C}_{16}) \\ & + (\Lambda_{2m, n} - \Lambda_{2m, n + \frac{1}{2}}) (\bar{S}_4 \bar{S}_{12} + \bar{C}_4 \bar{C}_{12} + \bar{S}_4 \bar{C}_{12} + \bar{C}_4 \bar{S}_{12}) (\bar{O}_{16} - \bar{C}_{16}) \\ & + (\Lambda_{2m+1, n} + \Lambda_{2m+1, n + \frac{1}{2}}) (\bar{O}_4 \bar{O}_{12} + \bar{V}_4 \bar{V}_{12} - \bar{V}_4 \bar{O}_{12} - \bar{O}_4 \bar{V}_{12}) (\bar{S}_{16} + \bar{V}_{16}) \\ & + (\Lambda_{2m+1, n} - \Lambda_{2m+1, n + \frac{1}{2}}) (\bar{O}_4 \bar{O}_{12} + \bar{V}_4 \bar{V}_{12} + \bar{V}_4 \bar{O}_{12} + \bar{O}_4 \bar{V}_{12}) (\bar{S}_{16} - \bar{V}_{16}) \} . \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

In order to obtain $Z_{oh} = h Z_{oo}$ let us recall how the operator h acts on the $SO(2n)$ characters. In particular we have

$$O_4 \rightarrow O_4 \quad , \quad V_4 \rightarrow -V_4 \quad , \quad S_4 \rightarrow -S_4 \quad , \quad C_4 \rightarrow C_4$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} O_{16} &= O_4 O_{12} + V_4 V_{12} \rightarrow +O_4 O_{12} - V_4 V_{12}, \\ V_{16} &= V_4 O_{12} + O_4 V_{12} \rightarrow -V_4 O_{12} + O_4 V_{12}, \\ S_{16} &= S_4 S_{12} + C_4 C_{12} \rightarrow -S_4 S_{12} + C_4 C_{12}, \\ C_{16} &= S_4 C_{12} + C_4 S_{12} \rightarrow -S_4 C_{12} + C_4 S_{12}. \end{aligned}$$

We also need to take into account that $h(\Lambda_1\Lambda_2) \rightarrow |\frac{2\eta}{\theta_2}|^4$. Therefore we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{\text{oh}} = & \frac{1}{4} \left[-V_4 O_4 + O_4 V_4 + S_4 S_4 - C_4 C_4 \right] \Lambda_{m',n'} \left| \frac{2\eta}{\theta_2} \right|^4 \\
& \times \left\{ (\Lambda_{2m,n} + \Lambda_{2m,n+\frac{1}{2}}) (-\bar{S}_4 \bar{S}_{12} + \bar{C}_4 \bar{C}_{12} + \bar{S}_4 \bar{C}_{12} - \bar{C}_4 \bar{S}_{12}) (\bar{O}_{16} + \bar{C}_{16}) \right. \\
& + (\Lambda_{2m,n} - \Lambda_{2m,n+\frac{1}{2}}) (-\bar{S}_4 \bar{S}_{12} + \bar{C}_4 \bar{C}_{12} - \bar{S}_4 \bar{C}_{12} + \bar{C}_4 \bar{S}_{12}) (\bar{O}_{16} - \bar{C}_{16}) \\
& + (\Lambda_{2m+1,n} + \Lambda_{2m+1,n+\frac{1}{2}}) (\bar{O}_4 \bar{O}_{12} - \bar{V}_4 \bar{V}_{12} + \bar{V}_4 \bar{O}_{12} - \bar{O}_4 \bar{V}_{12}) (\bar{V}_{16} + \bar{S}_{16}) \\
& \left. + (\Lambda_{2m+1,n} - \Lambda_{2m+1,n+\frac{1}{2}}) (\bar{O}_4 \bar{O}_{12} - \bar{V}_4 \bar{V}_{12} - \bar{V}_4 \bar{O}_{12} + \bar{O}_4 \bar{V}_{12}) (\bar{S}_{16} - \bar{V}_{16}) \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

The massless contributions are given by

$$\frac{\bar{C}_4 \bar{C}_{12} \bar{O}_{16}}{\bar{\eta}^8} \times \frac{O_4 V_4 - C_4 C_4}{\eta^8}, \quad \frac{\bar{S}_4 \bar{S}_{12} \bar{O}_{16}}{\bar{\eta}^8} \times \frac{V_4 O_4 - S_4 S_4}{\eta^8}, \tag{4.3}$$

since left and right contributions give

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\bar{C}_4 \bar{C}_{12} \bar{O}_{16}}{\bar{\eta}^8} & \sim 2^6 \bar{q}^0, \quad \frac{\bar{S}_4 \bar{S}_{12} \bar{O}_{16}}{\bar{\eta}^8} \sim 2^6 \bar{q}^0, \\
\frac{O_4 V_4}{\eta^8} & \sim 4q^0, \quad \frac{V_4 O_4}{\eta^8} \sim 4q^0, \quad \frac{S_4 S_4}{\eta^8} \sim 4q^0, \quad \frac{C_4 C_4}{\eta^8} \sim 4q^0.
\end{aligned}$$

From the expressions above one can read the content of the massless spectrum in terms of the six dimensional $N = (1, 1)$ (which gives $D = 4$ $N = 4$ supersymmetry upon the dimensional reduction to four dimensions) SUSY multiplets. In particular one has 2^6 massless $(1, 1)$ multiplets, whose bosonic part contains one vector and four scalar fields.

In order to obtain the partition function in the twisted sector one should apply the chain of transformations

$$Z_{\text{ho}} = S Z_{\text{oh}} \quad , \quad Z_{\text{hh}} = T Z_{\text{ho}}.$$

Doing so, one finally obtains²

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{\text{ho}} = & \frac{1}{4} \left[-V_4 C_4 + S_4 V_4 - O_4 S_4 + C_4 O_4 \right] \Lambda_{m',n'} \times 16 \left| \frac{\eta}{\theta_4} \right|^4 \\
& \times \left\{ (\Lambda_{2m,n} + \Lambda_{2m,n+\frac{1}{2}}) (\bar{O}_4 \bar{S}_{12} - \bar{O}_4 \bar{C}_{12} - \bar{V}_4 \bar{S}_{12} + \bar{V}_4 \bar{C}_{12}) (\bar{O}_{16} + \bar{C}_{16}) \right. \\
& + (\Lambda_{2m+1,n} + \Lambda_{2m+1,n+\frac{1}{2}}) (\bar{S}_4 \bar{O}_{12} - \bar{S}_4 \bar{V}_{12} + \bar{C}_4 \bar{V}_{12} - \bar{C}_4 \bar{O}_{12}) (\bar{S}_{16} + \bar{V}_{16}) \\
& + (\Lambda_{2m,n} - \Lambda_{2m,n+\frac{1}{2}}) (\bar{O}_4 \bar{S}_{12} + \bar{O}_4 \bar{C}_{12} + \bar{V}_4 \bar{S}_{12} + \bar{V}_4 \bar{C}_{12}) (\bar{O}_{16} - \bar{C}_{16}) \\
& \left. + (\Lambda_{2m+1,n} - \Lambda_{2m+1,n+\frac{1}{2}}) (\bar{S}_4 \bar{O}_{12} + \bar{S}_4 \bar{V}_{12} + \bar{C}_4 \bar{O}_{12} + \bar{C}_4 \bar{V}_{12}) (\bar{S}_{16} - \bar{V}_{16}) \right\},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

²In order to perform S transformations it is convenient to rewrite $CC - SS = \frac{1}{2}((C - S)(C + S) + (C + S)(C - S))$ etc.

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{\text{hh}} = & \frac{1}{4} \left[-V_4 C_4 + S_4 V_4 + O_4 S_4 - C_4 O_4 \right] \Lambda_{m',n'} \times 16 \left| \frac{\eta}{\theta_3} \right|^4 \\
& \times \left\{ (\Lambda_{2m,n} + \Lambda_{2m,n+\frac{1}{2}}) (-\bar{O}_4 \bar{S}_{12} + \bar{O}_4 \bar{C}_{12} - \bar{V}_4 \bar{S}_{12} + \bar{V}_4 \bar{C}_{12}) (\bar{O}_{16} + \bar{C}_{16}) \right. \\
& + (\Lambda_{2m+1,n} - \Lambda_{2m+1,n+\frac{1}{2}}) (\bar{S}_4 \bar{O}_{12} + \bar{S}_4 \bar{V}_{12} - \bar{C}_4 \bar{V}_{12} - \bar{C}_4 \bar{O}_{12}) (\bar{S}_{16} - \bar{V}_{16}) \\
& + (\Lambda_{2m,n} - \Lambda_{2m,n+\frac{1}{2}}) (-\bar{O}_4 \bar{S}_{12} - \bar{O}_4 \bar{C}_{12} + \bar{V}_4 \bar{S}_{12} + \bar{V}_4 \bar{C}_{12}) (\bar{O}_{16} - \bar{C}_{16}) \\
& \left. + (\Lambda_{2m+1,n} + \Lambda_{2m+1,n+\frac{1}{2}}) (\bar{S}_4 \bar{O}_{12} - \bar{S}_4 \bar{V}_{12} + \bar{C}_4 \bar{O}_{12} - \bar{C}_4 \bar{V}_{12}) (\bar{S}_{16} + \bar{V}_{16}) \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

The massless contributions are given by

$$\frac{\bar{O}_4 \bar{S}_{12} \bar{O}_{16}}{\bar{\eta}^2 \bar{\theta}_4^2} \times \frac{O_4 S_4 - C_4 O_4}{\eta^2 \theta_4^2}, \tag{4.6}$$

since left and right contributions give

$$\frac{\bar{C}_4 \bar{C}_{12} \bar{O}_{16}}{\bar{\eta}^2 \bar{\theta}_4^2} \sim 2^5 \bar{q}^0, \quad \frac{O_4 S_4}{\eta^2 \theta_4^2} \sim 2q^0, \quad \frac{C_4 O_4}{\eta^2 \theta_4^2} \sim 2q^0.$$

As it was for the case of the untwisted sector one can group the massless spectrum in terms on six dimensional supersymmetry multiplets. In the twisted sector one has $D = 6$ $N = 1$ supersymmetry (which gives $D = 4$ $N = 2$ upon the reduction to four dimensions) and the massless spectrum forms 2^5 half-hypermultiplets.

Repeating similar steps for the model (3.9) one obtains the following massless contributions. In the untwisted sector one has $N = 2$ $D = 6$ SUGRA multiplet and Yang–Mills multiplet

$$\frac{\bar{O}_4 \bar{O}_{12} \bar{O}_{16}}{\bar{\eta}^8} \times \frac{O_4 V_4 - C_4 C_4}{\eta^8}, \quad \frac{\bar{V}_4 \bar{V}_{12} \bar{O}_{16}}{\bar{\eta}^8} \times \frac{V_4 O_4 - S_4 S_4}{\eta^8}, \tag{4.7}$$

$$\frac{\bar{O}_4 \bar{V}_{12} \bar{V}_{16}}{\bar{\eta}^8} \times \frac{O_4 V_4 - C_4 C_4}{\eta^8}, \quad \frac{\bar{V}_4 \bar{O}_{12} \bar{V}_{16}}{\bar{\eta}^8} \times \frac{V_4 O_4 - S_4 S_4}{\eta^8} \tag{4.8}$$

and in the twisted sector one has $N = 1$, $D = 6$ half hypermultiplets

$$\frac{\bar{C}_4 \bar{V}_{12} \bar{O}_{16}}{\bar{\eta}^2 \bar{\theta}_4^2} \times \frac{O_4 S_4 - C_4 O_4}{\eta^2 \theta_4^2}, \quad \frac{\bar{S}_4 \bar{O}_{12} \bar{O}_{16}}{\bar{\eta}^2 \bar{\theta}_4^2} \times \frac{O_4 S_4 - C_4 O_4}{\eta^2 \theta_4^2}. \tag{4.9}$$

5 String Thermodynamics

In order to study further various properties of the model such as the asymptotic density of the states, the Hagedorn transitions etc., one can consider the string thermodynamics at nonzero temperature (see for example [19–24] and references therein). This is usually done by considering a propagation of the superstring with the time

coordinate being Wick rotated and compactified on a circle. The radius β of the compactified Euclidean time is inverse to the temperature T , i.e.,

$$X^0(\sigma, \tau) = x^0 + \frac{2\pi m\tau}{\beta} + \frac{n\beta\sigma}{\pi} + osc. \quad (5.1)$$

The corresponding free energy is expressed as an integral over the fundamental domain of the torus [22]

$$\frac{F}{V} = \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{1}{4\pi\alpha'} \right)^5 \int \frac{d^2\tau}{\tau_2^6} \sum_{n,m \in \mathbb{Z}} (\mathcal{V}_8(n, m) - \mathcal{S}_8(n, m)) (\overline{O}_{16} + \overline{S}_{16}) (\overline{O}_{16} + \overline{S}_{16}) e^{-S_\beta(n, m)}. \quad (5.2)$$

Here V is a spatial volume and the usual $SO(8)$ characters are modified according to

$$\mathcal{V}_8(n, m) = \frac{\theta_3^4 U_3(n, m) - \theta_4^4 U_4(n, m)}{2\eta^4}, \quad \mathcal{S}_8(n, m) = \frac{\theta_2^4 U_2(n, m) + \theta_1^4 U_1(n, m)}{2\eta^4}, \quad (5.3)$$

where

$$U_1(n, m) = \frac{1}{2} (-1 + (-1)^n + (-1)^m + (-1)^{n+m}), \quad (5.4)$$

$$U_2(n, m) = \frac{1}{2} (1 - (-1)^n + (-1)^m + (-1)^{n+m}),$$

$$U_3(n, m) = \frac{1}{2} (1 + (-1)^n + (-1)^m - (-1)^{n+m}),$$

$$U_4(n, m) = \frac{1}{2} (1 + (-1)^n - (-1)^m + (-1)^{n+m}),$$

and

$$S_\beta(n, m) = \frac{\beta^2}{4\pi\alpha'\tau_2} (m^2 + n^2 |\tau|^2 - 2\tau_1 nm). \quad (5.5)$$

The modular invariance of (5.2) can be easily checked using the rules

$$\begin{aligned} U_1(n, m) &\xrightarrow{S} U_1(m, -n) & , & \quad U_2(n, m) \xrightarrow{S} U_4(m, -n) & , \\ U_3(n, m) &\xrightarrow{S} U_3(m, -n) & , & \quad U_4(n, m) \xrightarrow{S} U_2(m, -n) & , \\ U_1(n, m) &\xrightarrow{T} U_1(n, m - n) & , & \quad U_2(n, m) \xrightarrow{T} U_2(n, m - n) & , \\ U_3(n, m) &\xrightarrow{T} U_4(n, m - n) & , & \quad U_4(n, m) \xrightarrow{T} U_3(n, m - n) & , \\ S_\beta(n, m) &\xrightarrow{S} S_\beta(m, -n) & , & \quad S_\beta(n, m) \xrightarrow{T} S_\beta(n, m - n) & . \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

As a result of the compactification on the circle the mass-shell condition for the heterotic string gets modified by the terms which involve the temperature

$$\frac{M_R^2}{8} = N - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\pi \tilde{m}}{\beta} - \frac{n\beta}{2\pi} \right)^2, \quad \frac{M_L^2}{8} = \tilde{N} - 1 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\pi \tilde{m}}{\beta} + \frac{n\beta}{2\pi} \right)^2, \quad (5.7)$$

where $\tilde{m}$ is allowed to assume also half-integer values [22]. As a result of the presence of the functions $U_i(n, m)$ in the partition functions, the usual GSO projection gets modified and certain states which have been projected out at zero temperature may reappear, such as for example $N = \tilde{N} = 0$ and $n = 1, \tilde{m} = \frac{1}{2}$. Due to the dependence on β in the mass-shell equations these states become tachyonic at certain temperature (Hagedorn transition) indicating the instability of the system at high energies.

Now one can follow the same lines as for the case of $T = 0$. Let us note that the modification comparing to the case of $T = 0$ is $(V_8 - S_8) \rightarrow (\mathcal{V}_8 - \mathcal{S}_8)e^{-S_\beta}$, whereas the right part of the partition function with nonzero temperature is the same as in (4.2), (4.4), (4.5) and we shall not spell it out explicitly. After applying consequently Z_2 , S and T transformations on $(\mathcal{V}_8 - \mathcal{S}_8)$ one gets therefore:

- For Z_{oo} in eq. (4.1), $[V_4O_4 + O_4V_4 - S_4S_4 - C_4C_4]$ is substituted by

$$\frac{1}{2\eta^4} \sum_{m,n} (U_3\theta_3^2\theta_3^2 - U_4\theta_4^2\theta_4^2 - U_2\theta_2^2\theta_2^2 - U_1\theta_1^2\theta_1^2) e^{-S_\beta} \quad (5.8)$$

- For Z_{oh} in eq. (4.2), $[-V_4O_4 + O_4V_4 + S_4S_4 - C_4C_4]$ is substituted by

$$\frac{1}{2\eta^4} \sum_{m,n} (U_3\theta_3^2\theta_3^2 - U_4\theta_4^2\theta_4^2 - U_2\theta_2^2\theta_2^2 - U_1\theta_1^2\theta_1^2) e^{-S_\beta} \quad (5.9)$$

- For Z_{ho} in eq. (4.4), $[-V_4C_4 + S_4V_4 - O_4S_4 + C_4O_4]$ is substituted by

$$\frac{1}{2\eta^4} \sum_{m,n} (U_3\theta_2^2\theta_3^2 - U_2\theta_3^2\theta_2^2 - U_4\theta_1^2\theta_4^2 - U_1\theta_4^2\theta_1^2) e^{-S_\beta} \quad (5.10)$$

- For Z_{hh} in eq. (4.5), $[-V_4C_4 + S_4V_4 + O_4S_4 - C_4C_4]$ is substituted by

$$\frac{1}{2\eta^4} \sum_{m,n} (U_3\theta_2^2\theta_4^2 - U_4\theta_4^2\theta_2^2 - U_2\theta_1^2\theta_3^2 - U_1\theta_3^2\theta_1^2) e^{-S_\beta}. \quad (5.11)$$

Now having the partition function one can study in detail the corresponding high energy thermodynamics following the lines of [24]. On the other hand, having introduced the temperature dependence into the partition function, one can consider a more general orbifold projection compared to the one which has been done in the section 3. Namely, one can make the sign in the projection (3.2) to depend on the integers n and m , which corresponds to the "compactified" time direction. In other words, one can introduce the temperature dependence into the orbifold projection as well. In this case one can consider a certain duality between two a priori different models considered above. A particular choice of the $+$ sign in (3.2) if both m and n are even and of the $-$ sign if at least one of m and n is odd leads to the modular invariant partition function which is a superposition of the partition functions Z'_- (for m, n even) and Z_- (for at least one of m, n is odd). In this particular model one has the gravity and Yang-Mills fields from the model described by Z'_- , whereas the massive excitations are described by the ones of both Z'_- and Z_- .

6 Conclusions

In this paper we studied orbifolds of the heterotic $E_8 \times E_8$ string in which the graviton is projected out. Our starting point is the partition function of the $E_8 \times E_8$ heterotic-string compactified on a six torus $T^2 \times T^2 \times T^2$. Our $Z_2 \times Z_2$ orbifold includes a specific shift-orbifold projection which acts on an internal circle coupled with the fermion numbers of the gauge degrees of freedom. The action of this orbifold, in general, results in the breaking of $E_8 \times E_8$ to $SO(16) \times SO(16)$ and reproduces the equivalent breaking in the quasi-realistic free fermionic models, where it is realised by a discrete choice of a generalised GSO phase. Our paper clarifies in this sense the relation between free fermion models and orbifold models. The breaking induced by the orbifold of eq. (2.15) can be implemented in constructions of quasi-realistic orbifold models. The phenomenological advantages that it may offer over conventional Wilson-line breaking is in the Higgs-matter splitting [6]. We then studied variations of this $Z_2 \times Z_2$ orbifold by modifying the sign of the orbifold and constructing the modular invariant partition function. Additionally, we studied a Z_2 projection which acts on four out of six coordinates of the compactified torus.

Depending on the sign of the generator of the orbifold groups one gets different models. The resulting models are modular invariant. They possess $N = 4$, or $N = 2$, space-time supersymmetry and have rather different low energy spectra. While the first contains the graviton and the gauge vector bosons among its massless excitation, the second model has neither graviton nor Yang-Mills fields in the massless spectrum, anywhere in the moduli space, owing to the absence of the $\overline{O}_{16}\overline{O}_{16}$ character in the partition function. In the third model that we introduced the $\overline{O}_{16}\overline{O}_{16}$ character does appear in the partition, but couples to the lattice term $\Lambda_{2m+1,n}$, which is massive at a generic point in the moduli space. It is tempting to conjecture a closer connection of the latter two models with the little string theory, where the graviton is also consistently decoupled, without taking the low energy limit $\alpha' \rightarrow 0$. A more detailed study of the thermodynamics of the model could hopefully give some more insight into a possible connection with little string theories, where the high energy thermodynamics has been studied extensively [8, 9]. We have further seen that the massive spectrum in the resulting partition functions does not admit the conventional spin-statistics assignments. In the third model this is clearly the case, as the terms with the "wrong" statistics couple to a lattice term, with winding modes shifted by $1/2$, whereas in the second case closer examination of the relevant characters shows that this is indeed the case. We therefore see a connection between the projection of the graviton and the reversal of the usual spin-statistics assignments in the massive string spectrum. Curiously enough, the massless terms still preserve the conventional spin-statistics assignments. Clearly, the absence of the graviton and the gauge vector bosons, as well as the mismatch of the spin-statistics, mean that these models are not physical vacua. We articulated that this indicates the existence of ghosts in these models, but owing to the existence of the Jacobi identity on the supersymmetric side and the su-

persymmetric nonrenormalisation theorems, their partition functions correspond to mathematically consistent solutions for one-, as well as multi-loop, amplitudes. One may question whether the correct spin-statistics assignments need to hold for the massive string spectrum. The change of the conventional spin-statistics assignments in the massive string spectrum may indicate the breaking of Lorentz covariance, a tenant of local quantum field theories, above the string scale.

We briefly discussed the generalization of our orbifold models to the case when the orbifold projection depends on the temperature. This generalization allows in a certain sense to combine the two models under the consideration. In this case the gravity and Yang-Mills theories appear at the low energy spectrum while the massive excitations are described by the ones of both models.

The string solutions presented in this paper are clearly non-conventional. In string constructions to date the correct spin-statistics assignment for all string states is taken as a pivotal requirement. However, our view is that our understanding of string theory is still very rudimentary. Its varying features should be explored and “conventional wisdom” be challenged in order to gain deeper insight. The existence of mathematically consistent string solutions, which do not contain gravity, possibly coupled with a breakdown of Lorentz covariance above the string scale, suggests an interesting scenario. Namely, gravity and local gauge theories as emerging effective field theories below the string scale.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Carlo Angelantonj, Thomas Mohaupt, Mirian Tsulaia and Cristina Timirgaziu for useful discussions. This work was supported by the STFC and the University of Liverpool.

References

- [1] C.M. Hull and P.K. Townsend, Nucl. Phys. B **438** (1995) 109.
- [2] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B **443** (1995) 85.
- [3] L. J. Dixon and J. A. Harvey, Nucl. Phys. B **274** (1986) 93.
- [4] H. Kawai, D.C. Lewellen, and S.H.-H. Tye, Phys. Rev. D **34** (1986) 3794.
- [5] O. Lebedev *et al*, Phys. Rev. D **77** (2008) 046013.
- [6] A.E. Faraggi, *Eur. Phys. Jour.* **C49** (2007) 803.
- [7] A.E. Faraggi, Phys. Lett. B **544** (2002) 207.
- [8] D. Kutasov and D. A. Sahakyan, JHEP **0102** (2001) 021.

- [9] T. Harmark and N.A. Obers, Phys. Lett. B **485** (2000) 285.
- [10] O. Aharony, Class. Quant. Grav. **17** (2000) 929.
- [11] D. Kutasov, *Prepared for ICTP Spring School on Superstrings and Related Matters, Trieste, Italy, 2-10 Apr 2001*
- [12] A.E. Faraggi, C. Kounnas and J. Rizos, Nucl. Phys. B **714** (2007) 208; Nucl. Phys. B **799** (2008) 19;
T. Catelin-Jullien, A.E. Faraggi, C. Kounnas and J. Rizos, Nucl. Phys. B **812** (2009) 103.
- [13] I. Antoniadis, C. Bachas, and C. Kounnas, Nucl. Phys. B **289** (1987) 87;
H. Kawai, D.C. Lewellen, and S.H.-H. Tye, Nucl. Phys. B **288** (1987) 1.
- [14] A.E. Faraggi and D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Rev. D **48** (1993) 3288.
- [15] For a recent review see *e.g.*:
A.E. Faraggi, arXiv:0809.2641, and references therein.
- [16] A.E. Faraggi, Phys. Lett. B **326** (1994) 62.
- [17] K. Narain, Phys. Lett. B **169** (1986) 41;
K.S. Narain, M.H. Sarmadi and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B **279** (1987) 369.
- [18] C. Angelantonj and A. Sagnotti, Phys. Rept. **371** (2002) 1.
- [19] B. McClain and B. D. B. Roth, Commun. Math. Phys. **111** (1987) 539.
- [20] K. H. O'Brien and C. I. Tan, Phys. Rev. D **36** (1987) 1184.
- [21] J. Polchinski, Commun. Math. Phys. **104** (1986) 37.
- [22] J. J. Atick and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B **310** (1988) 291.
- [23] M. J. Bowick and S. B. Giddings, Nucl. Phys. B **325** (1989) 631.
- [24] N. Deo, S. Jain and C. I. Tan, Phys. Lett. B **220** (1989) 125.